

to New England took on the form of Congregationalism, and that which found its way to South Carolina had not sufficient vitality to survive the intolerance of the Episcopal Establishment.

We shall not be far astray if we assert that the only Presbyterians in South Carolina two hundred years ago who deserve to be counted, the only ones who have any connection historically by continuity of succession with the Presbyterians of the present day, were the few Scotch and Scotch-Irish who were mixed with a lot of Congregationalists in Charleston, and scattered in small numbers over the neighboring islands and in the communities adjacent to Charleston.

The total white population of South Carolina two hundred years ago, including men, women and children, was 4,080. Seventeen hundred of these were children, leaving the white adult population 2,380. It is a liberal estimate to count ten per cent, 238, of these as genuine, dyed-in-the-wool Presbyterians. While the stream of Presbyterianism is not so large as we could wish, yet when compared with the smallness of the fountain it does not suggest "drying up."

Lest my motive be misunderstood, let me say that I sympathize with the feelings of brother Caldwell as he reviews the history of Presbyterianism in Charleston Presbytery. Even the Scotch and Scotch-Irish element was chilled in its youth by the moderatism of the mother county, whence it drew its life. As a result it differed so materially from the general type of Presbyterianism in this country that it refused to unite with any other body of Presbyterians until 1811. To this day it lags far behind the growth of the Church at large. During the sixteen years between 1890 and 1906, the Southern Presbyterian Church increased forty-nine per cent, while Charleston Presbytery increased only nineteen per cent. Dr. Caldwell may, therefore, be pardoned for using desperate measures, if he can thereby startle Charleston Presbytery out of its apparent apathy.

## THE MINISTRY AND THE CHURCHES.

By Rev. Thos. P. Hay, D. D.

The following words by J. Angell James, on the death of a minister, come with a solemn and pathetic appeal to the Church of our times:

"The testimony of a witness for God to an unbelieving generation is finished; a herald of salvation is withdrawn; an ambassador of Christ is recalled; a light of the world, which has guided many, and might have guided more, into the haven of eternal peace, is extinguished.

"It is not the death of a friend merely, however valued, or of a relative however dear, whose affection soothed the sorrows of time and softened the rugged path of life; but it is the removal of one whose solicitude watched for the soul, promoted its salvation and diffused, or aimed to defuse, a beneficial influence over its eternal existence. What arithmetic can estimate the greatness of such a calamity? Instead of that living voice which, both by the eloquence of preaching, and the still holier and more elevating eloquence of prayer, often lifted the rapt hearers to heaven and matured them for its glories—they have nothing now but the cold and silent marble, which perpetuated with

his honored name their own incalculable loss."

We who are ministers in active service need continually to be reminded of our sublime calling and of its sacred duties. Will our ministry awaken any such sentiments and sense of loss among God's people, when we pass away from these earthly scenes and employments? Will immortal souls and tempted and sorrowing saints miss us sorely? A restless ministry, eager for change, seeking for the conspicuous pulpits and large salaries, can never know those sacred relationships and tender ties which make the highest usefulness possible, or command the strong love of God's people which feels the sense of incalculable loss in the decease.

If the Church thus honors and prizes God's ambassadors, and appreciates their priceless officers, and laments over "the cold and silent marble" of their mortal remains, would she leave the disabled ambassadors to want, who are appointed to serve by patient waiting in old age before the Lord calls them up higher? Would she provide meagerly and grudgingly for those widows of ambassadors whose lives have been almost as much a benediction to the Church as those of their husbands?

And if ministers and churches thus answered to the divine ideal, many evils would disappear from our modern ecclesiastical life. Pastors would not become so readily *personae non gratae*, if congregations realized that they were dealing with Christ's ambassadors. These frequent heart-burnings and conflicts which end many a useful pastorate would be heard of no more. The dissolution of a pastoral relation would be almost as sorrowful as the final earthly farewell to a revered and beloved friend. And our pastorless churches would be seeking ambassadors of God, and not—as some one has said—looking for men who are "the best hand-shakers and will be most punctilious in visiting Mrs. Smith once a month.

And this happy condition of affairs would make a very strong appeal to the pious and aspiring young men of the church to seek the sacred office. Many an obstacle would be removed by the assurance that the consecrated young man, who devotes his best self and his entire life to the service of the Church, would be received and treated as a "herald of salvation." The assurance that he will not be asked to ply the political arts of the candidate for opportunity to preach the glorious gospel; or have a "dead line" drawn across his course at the point where he will have matured into his best proficiency, or be treated like a common hireling if he does not succeed in pleasing everybody, or will not consent to be "muzzled"; or be considered as an unwelcome pensioner if his Lord appoints that his earthly life shall extend beyond the term of his bodily vigor and active service.

Gainesville, Florida.

The world ridicules the contentions which occasionally occur between different classes of Christians or religious faiths, and then illustrates its own superiority to contentions and its aloofness from it by being all agog over the utterly useless problem of whether Cook or Peary first reached the "pole" on the "top of the world."